

Weak Quantum Theory and the Emergence of Time

Hartmann Römer*

Fakultät für Physik der Universität Freiburg
Hermann-Herder-Str. 3
D-79104 Freiburg, Germany

February 1, 2008

Abstract

We present a scenario, how time could emerge in the framework of Weak Quantum Theory. In a process, similar to the emergence of time in quantum cosmology, time arises after an epistemic split of the *unus mundus* as a quality of the individual conscious mind. Synchronization with matter and other mental systems is achieved by entanglement correlations. In the course of its operationalization, time loses its original quality of A-time and the B-time of physics as measured by clocks will appear.

*email: hartmann.roemer@physik.uni-freiburg.de

1 Introduction

The task of this study is the establishment and description of a scenario for the emergence of time in the framework of Weak Quantum Theory [1], a generalization of quantum theory applicable beyond the ordinary domain of physics but containing essential quantum theoretical features like complementarity and entanglement.

The mysterious origin and nature of time have ever since been a permanent subject of human thinking and philosophy [5]. Later, also physics and, more recently, brain physiology and neuroscience [6] have contributed to these questions. Time is given to us in two very different forms: first as internal time, as an immediate mode of our personal existence and secondly as external time, the kind of entity which appears in physics and is measured by clocks. Employing a distinction introduced by McTaggart [10], internal time can be characterized as *A-time*: there is an essential quality of "nowness" which distinguishes presence from past and future. Presence is continuously moving into the future and thereby turning into past. A-time may also admit additional qualities: good and favorable or bad and unfavorable for certain tasks. The Greek notion of *καίρος* is an example for a quality associated to A-time. A-time is also called "tempus" as opposed to "time", because it underlies the tempora of the verb in many human languages. On the other hand, *B-time* is the time of physics. All points of B-time are equivalent and void of any additional qualities, they are just points on a linear scale, the only and fundamental distinction being a (partial) ordering in the sense of "earlier" and "later". Even this directedness of B-time is absent in physics, if time inversion symmetry is assumed to hold.

The questions about internal and external time cannot be addressed without reference to the problem of the relationship between mind and matter. Here, we cannot enter into a deeper discussion of this complicated complex of problems, which has a long history and is presently a subject of intensive discussion and research [11]. We can only classify the positions which are logically possible in order to provide a coordinate system in which we can locate our own standpoint.

The first and principle distinction is between *dualistic* and *monistic* conceptions of mind and matter.

In modern philosophy, Descartes [13] is usually considered to be the first and most prominent proponent of dualism. Under the terms "res cogitans" and "res extensa", mind and matter are fundamentally different substances of different ontological status. The main problem of all dualistic theories is the explanation of mutual causation or, more generally, of correlations between mind and matter. After all, mind and matter go together and both of them take part in most events happening with us in our world. Several solutions have been proposed among which we only mention Descartes' theory of causation, the occasionalism of Malbranche [14] and, in particular, Leibniz' [15] notion of prestabilized harmony. According to Leibniz, matter and mind always go in parallel, not because of any interaction between them but because they are perfectly synchronized by their divine creator. Many people have noticed the

striking similarity between such a prestabilized harmony and the interactionless correlations appearing in quantum systems in entangled states.

It is fair to say that at present, partly because of the difficulties mentioned, dualistic approaches have largely fallen out of favour.

Monistic theories of mind and matter deny the existence of two separate substances for them. According to the degree of priority attributed to either matter or mind, they can be classified in a threefold way.

- *Matter over mind* theories consider some form of matter to be the only fundamental substance of the world. There are large differences between the various concepts of matter in such theories. If mind is at all admitted as a decent object of investigation, it is conceived as an epiphenomenon, a feature of the "Überbau" or as an emergent feature of matter. Again, there is a plethora of different conceptions of emergence. The majority of working scientists, biologists and neurophysiologists even more than physicists, seem to favour some version of a matter over mind theory, which, in addition, appears to be supported by the impressive success of modern science and fits in very well with the widespread materialistic view of the world.
- *Mind over matter* theories are adopted in a rather diffuse way by many esoteric circles. An intellectually viable example of this conception is the philosophy of Hegel [16], for whom the substance of the world is of genuinely spiritual nature such that events in the material world are manifestations of the dynamic and dialectic self-reflection of this universal spirit.
- *Neutral monistic* theories consider matter and mind to be different manifestations of equal right of one and the same substance, which in itself is neither matter nor mind. This is the point of view we shall adopt. It is presently gaining ground among professionals [12] of the mind and matter problem. It was clearly formulated by Spinoza [17], for whom, out of a possible infinity of modi in which one and the same universal substance could manifest itself, mind and matter are just those two modi which are accessible for human beings. More recently, neutral monism has been advocated by C.G. Jung. He started out from his theory of the collective unconscious, an extension of the individual mind into a transpersonal collective domain of psychic character, regulated by general abstract but emotionally loaded patterns which he called *archetypes*. Later and partly under the influence of W. Pauli [7], [8], the archetypes turned into even more abstract regulating principles within the domain of the *unus mundus*, which is imagined to be neutral with respect to the distinction between mind and matter. Synchronistic phenomena like the so-called meaningful coincidences could thus be described as partly physical and partly psychic manifestation of archetypal configurations. It was in particular W. Pauli, one of the fathers of quantum theory, who compared this structure with quantum theory and conceived the distinction of matter and mind as a kind of symmetry breaking in the *unus mundus*. Material and mental descriptions of the *unus*

mundus could thus be considered as complementary in the sense of quantum theory. In the same way the causal order in the physical world and the order of sense and meaning were interpreted as complementary.

The above-mentioned threefold distinction has, of course a bearing on the problem of the relationship between internal and external time. For instance, a materialist would probably postulate a priority of the physical B-type time and consider internal A-time to be a derived notion. However, it has turned out to be extremely difficult to derive the directedness of the time in thermodynamics as well as the directedness of internal time from a time symmetric physical background. Indeed, none of the proposed derivations of the "arrow of time" is completely satisfactory. On closer inspection, almost all of these derivations, with the possible exception of the cosmological time arrow, either explicitly or silently take recourse to the psychological arrow of internal time. Even more difficult is the derivation of the unique and characteristic quality of "now" in internal time, in fact, to such an extent that this problem is often ignored, defined away or declared meaningless.

Our own approach presented in this study starts out from a neutral monistic conception of mind and matter. We shall locate the origin of time in the personal consciousness assuming that time is essentially and intimately related to our form of existence as conscious individual beings. Supporting evidence for this assumption comes from the common observation that the unconscious dimension does not seem to know about time. Already in dreams the dimension of time starts fading away and the deeper parts of unconscious and, even more so, the collective unconscious are entirely timeless. Also C. G. Jung's *unus mundus* is explicitly assumed to be timeless [7]. There is a long tradition in philosophy relating time to our form of existence. For Augustinus [18], A-time is the mode and limitation of the finite rather than infinite existence of human beings. For Immanuel Kant [19] time is similar to Newton's B-time. He considers time to be the form of the interior sense of humans, prior to and a prerequisite for any act of cognition. Also in the 20th century philosophy of existence [20], [21] A-time is tied to human existence as an essential determining feature. There are, of course, alternatives to our approach. For instance H. Primas [4], in a remarkable study about the origin of time, associates a time of B-type primarily to a collective mental dimension of the world.

Our strategy in attacking the problem of the origin of time is to apply Weak Quantum Theory to a primarily undivided *unus mundus*. The main theses we shall try to develop are [3]

- The *unus mundus* is timeless and neutral with respect to the distinction of mind and matter. This distinction only arises after an "epistemic splitting" of the *unus mundus* by separating a "conscious observer" from the rest of the world. Observables pertaining to mind and matter aspects of the *unus mundus* are in general complementary. Such a splitting is the prerequisite for and inevitably connected with any act of cognition in the most general sense that someone arrives at knowledge or information about something. It is only after this epistemic split that time can arise. One should notice that also

animals can learn about their surroundings and have some sense of time. This means that full human consciousness of the "conscious observer" is not required for the epistemic split and the emergence of time. Primarily, time emerges as A-time, related to the conscious observer. The process of emergence shows a formal analogy with the arrival of time in the Wheeler-de Witt equation [24] of quantum cosmology where the quantum state of the universe allows for the interpretation of certain observables as time observables.

- The transfer of time to material systems and the synchronization with other observers and material subsystems are effected by entanglement correlations due to the state of the *unus mundus*.
- Physical B-time arises by a complicated process of redefinition, gauging and operationalization certainly requiring full human consciousness. In the course of this process, time loses most of its qualities and may eventually disappear by "deconstruction".

The material of this work is organized in the following way:

In Chapter 2 we provide the minimum of Weak Quantum Theory necessary for following our arguments.

Chapter 3 is devoted to the somewhat problematic notion of the set of observables and the state of the universe. The crucial role of the epistemic split and, as a consequence, the observer dependence of the set of observables are pointed out. In addition, we describe, how physical quantum theory can be embedded into Weak Quantum Theory.

Chapter 4 starts with a description of a toy model for the Wheeler-de Witt equation. It illustrates how time can arise as a property of the quantum state in an initially timeless situation. Subsequently, we briefly describe how time can be introduced in cosmology by a solution of the Wheeler-de Witt equation.

In Chapter 5 a partially analogous scenario for the emergence of time in Weak Quantum Theory is worked out.

Chapter 6, which is more than an appendix will contain additional remarks, questions and speculations.

In spite of mutual independence, there will be some overlap between our work and the ingenious study of H. Primas [4], in particular concerning the importance of symmetry breaking in the *unus mundus* and the function of entanglement correlations. Similarities and differences of our approaches will be mentioned along with our presentation. To the educated reader, many of our ideas will not be unfamiliar, a situation to be expected for such an old subject under vivid actual discussion. We still hope that she or he will appreciate our kind of synthesis as well as quite a few novel features.

2 A Sketch of Weak Quantum Theory

Weak Quantum Theory is a generalization of quantum theory devised to be applicable beyond the range of ordinary physical systems. It was obtained starting out from the algebraic formulation of quantum theory and relaxing all those axioms which seem to be special to the physical world. The remaining more general structure is still rich enough to be able to describe quantum like phenomena like complementarity [2] and entanglement in a much more general setting. Here, we give a short sketch of the structure of Weak Quantum Theory just sufficient to make the presentation in this work reasonably self sustained. For details as well as for several applications of Weak Quantum theory we refer to the original publications [1], [9].

In Weak Quantum Theory, the fundamental notions of *system*, *state* and *observable* are taken over from ordinary quantum theory:

- A system Σ is any part of reality in the most general sense, which can, at least in principle, be isolated from the rest of the world and be the subject of an investigation.
- A system is assumed to have the capacity to reside in different states. The notion of state also has an epistemic side, reflecting the degree of knowledge of an observer about the system. Unlike in ordinary quantum mechanics, the set $\mathcal{Z}$ of states is not assumed to have an underlying linear Hilbert space structure.
- An observable A of a system Σ is any feature of Σ which can be investigated in a (more or less) meaningful way. Let $\mathcal{A}$ denote the set of observables. Just like in ordinary quantum mechanics, observables A in $\mathcal{A}$ can be identified with functions on the set of states: Any observable $A \in \mathcal{A}$ associates to every state $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ another state $A(z) \in \mathcal{Z}$. As functions on the set of states, observables A and B can be composed by applying A after B . The composed map AB is also assumed to be an observable. Observables A and B are called *compatible* or *commensurable* if they commute, i.e. if $AB = BA$. Noncommuting observables with $AB \neq BA$ are called *complementary* or *incompatible*. In ordinary quantum theory, observables can also added, multiplied by complex numbers and conjugated, and the set of observables is endowed with a rich structure called C^* -algebra structure. In Weak Quantum Theory, observables can only be multiplied by the above composition. This gives the set of observables a much simpler so-called *semigroup structure*.

In ref [1], Weak Quantum Theory is characterized by a list of axioms. Here, we only give the most important properties:

- To every observable $A \in \mathcal{A}$ there is an associated set $\text{spec}A$, which is called its *spectrum*. The set $\text{spec}A$ is just the set of different outcomes or results of the investigation ("measurement") corresponding to the observable A .

- *Propositions* are special observables P with $PP = P$ and $\text{spec}P \subset \{yes, no\}$. They simply correspond to yes-no questions about the system Σ . For every proposition P there is a negation $\bar{P}$ compatible with P . For compatible propositions P_1 and P_2 there exists a conjunction $P_1 \wedge P_2 = P_1 P_2$ and an adjunction $P_1 \vee P_2 = \overline{\bar{P}_1 \wedge \bar{P}_2}$. The laws of ordinary proposition logic are assumed to hold for compatible propositions.
- If z is a state and P is a proposition with $P(z) \neq 0$, then $P(z)$ is a state for which P is true with certainty. This emphasizes the constructive nature of measurement as preparation and verification.
- The following property generalizes the spectral property of observables in ordinary quantum theory. To every observable A and every element $\alpha \in \text{spec}A$ there belongs a proposition A_α which is just the proposition that α is the outcome of a measurement of A . Then

$$A_\alpha A_\beta = A_\beta A_\alpha = 0 \text{ for } \alpha \neq \beta, \quad AA_\alpha = A_\alpha A, \quad \bigvee_{\alpha \in \text{spec}A} A_\alpha = \mathbb{1} \quad (1)$$

where 0 and $\mathbb{1}$ are just the trivial propositions which are never and always true respectively.

We already mentioned that Weak Quantum Theory is rich enough to encompass the notions of complementarity and entanglement. For complementary observables A and B with $AB \neq BA$, the order of their measurement matters, and, just like in ordinary quantum mechanics, they will not, in general, possess states in which both of them have a well defined value with certainty.

Entanglement arises if global observables pertaining to all of a system Σ are complementary to local observables pertaining to parts of Σ . In an entangled state, for instance in a state in which a global observable has a well defined value, there are typical interactionless entanglement correlations between the results of measurements of local observables. In ordinary quantum theory, it can be proved that entanglement cannot be used for signal transmission or causal intervention. In Weak Quantum Theory, it may be wise to postulate this feature ¹ as an additional axiom [3] supplementing the axioms of ref [1].

Notice, that Weak Quantum Theory, at least in its minimal version presented here, does not associate quantified probabilities to the outcomes of a measurement of an observable A . This is related to the absence of a Hilbert state structure of the set $\mathcal{Z}$ of states. Moreover, the notion of time is completely absent in the general formulation of Weak Quantum Theory.

Planck's constant $\hbar$ which controls the degree of noncommutativity in ordinary quantum theory, does not enter into Weak Quantum Theory.

¹I am grateful to Walter von Lucadou for pointing this out to me

At this place, we should like to mention another possible enrichment [3] of the axioms of ref [1], to which we shall return at the end of this study. One could admit a more general kind of observables without an associated spectrum, for which the name *preobservables* might be appropriate. Preobservables are meant to correspond to an expectationless precategorical state of attention of the observer. Only after the establishment of a horizon of expectations as a result of additional experience, it may become possible to associate a spectrum to them and to turn them into full ordinary observables. We hope to come back to this issue in a separate publication.

3 Observables and Epistemic Splitting

Weak Quantum Theory is a very general theory meant to be applicable to all kinds of systems Σ , which can be singled out for investigation from the rest of the world. What we have in mind here, is an application of Weak Quantum Theory to the totality of the *unus mundus*. This is not an unproblematic enterprise. The same problem arises in quantum cosmology, where ordinary quantum mechanics is applied to the whole cosmos: the very name of an "observable" betrays, that the existence of an observer outside the observed system is presupposed and that both ordinary and Weak Quantum Theory primarily apply to the description of systems as seen from an outside observer. In what way does it make sense to talk about the wave function of the universe or the state of the *unus mundus*?

First of all, it is always possible to enlarge a system Σ_1 by inclusion of parts Σ_2 previously outside Σ_1 . For example, one may include the observer of a system Σ into a larger system and study the interaction of Σ with its observer in the enlarged system (possibly as observed by a "superobserver").

In ordinary quantum theory, there exists a canonical tensor product construction for the Hilbert space of states and the algebra of observables of a composite system from its components. This is not at our disposal in Weak Quantum Theory, but one can at least say [1] that the state space and the semigroup of observables of a composed system will contain the Cartesian product of the state spaces and observable semigroups of its components:

$$\mathcal{A} \supset \mathcal{A}_1 \times \mathcal{A}_2, \quad \mathcal{Z} \supset \mathcal{Z}_1 \times \mathcal{Z}_2, \quad (2)$$

$$\mathcal{A}_1(\mathcal{Z}_1) \subset \mathcal{Z}_1, \quad \mathcal{A}_2(\mathcal{Z}_2) \subset \mathcal{Z}_2. \quad (3)$$

At least as important as the enlargement of systems is the possibility of analyzing systems by identifying subsystems in them, whose mutual relationship can be investigated. This act of decomposition into subsystems is a constitutive mental act. There are infinitely many ways to decompose a system into subsystems, and the kind of decomposition is not dictated by the system itself. Rather, the system as such remains unchanged after decomposition. In this sense, the decomposition is a purely mental act. On the other hand, it is fair to say,

that it is only by decomposition, that the subsystems come into being, which underlines the creative status of decomposition. Mahler [26] strongly points out this double importance of decomposition and takes it as the point at which consciousness can intervene in our world. In ordinary quantum mechanics, decomposition corresponds to a tensor product decomposition of the Hilbert space of states and the algebra of observables:

$$\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2, \quad \mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_1 \otimes \mathcal{A}_2 \quad (4)$$

and in Weak Quantum Theory subsemigroups and subsets of states have to be identified fulfilling eq 2. The decomposition of a system into subsystems can be considered as a symmetry breaking, because it introduces distinctions which are not dictated by the system itself.

In view of the twofold possibility of composition and decomposition or of synthesis and analysis, talking about the universe or the *unus mundus* as a system appears to be a reasonable extrapolation. This kind of extrapolation is, for instance, employed in quantum cosmology, where ordinary quantum theory is applied to the universe as a whole. In Weak Quantum Theory where no probabilities are attributed to measurements, the problem may even be alleviated somewhat, because an ensemble interpretation seems to be less mandatory than for ordinary quantum theory.

The first and most important act of decomposition is the epistemic splitting, the inevitable starting point of any act of cognition, whereby a observer is set apart from what he/she observes. We already mentioned that the notion of an observable presupposes an epistemic split. Moreover the epistemic split is unresolvably connected to the appearance of consciousness in however rudimentary form. What is required is that some entity is set apart from the rest of the world in maintaining itself, gaining information about its environment and reacting to it. Higher levels of consciousness also involve a capacity to form a self representation in a self model as described in detail by Th. Metzinger [22]. Observations in the technical sense will require such higher states of consciousness.

Weak Quantum Theory has to face the problem to explain how the material or physical world can be embedded into a supposedly larger system possessing also nonmaterial features. This can actually be achieved in the following way:

Inside the large semigroup of observables there is a subsemigroup of material observables:

$$\mathcal{A}_{matter} \subset \mathcal{A} \quad (5)$$

Now, $\mathcal{A}_{matter}$ has the richer structure of a C^* -algebra. A state $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ gives rise to a positive linear complex valued expectation value functional E_z defined on $\mathcal{A}_{matter}$:

$$E_z(\alpha A + \beta B) = \alpha E_z(A) + \beta E_z(B) \quad (6)$$

$$E_z(A^* A) \geq 0 \quad (7)$$

for complex α, β and A, B in $\mathcal{A}_{matter}$. For observables $A \in \mathcal{A}_{matter}$, the spectrum $spec A$ should be contained in the set of complex numbers.

This establishes the ordinary probability interpretation for quantum theory in the material world. Planck's constant h will play its role in $\mathcal{A}_{matter}$. Two states z and z' are called *physically equivalent*, if their associated expectation value functionals coincide.

$$z \sim z' \Leftrightarrow E_z(A) = E_{z'}(A) \text{ for all } A \in \mathcal{A}_{matter} \quad (8)$$

The resulting equivalence classes should be called *physical states*. Matter observables $A \in \mathcal{A}_{matter}$ will transform physical states into physical states. This is not expected to be true for other observables in $\mathcal{A}$. Starting from any physical state, a physical Hilbert space can be obtained by the GNS construction [25]. As a linear operator on a Hilbert space and also as an element of a C^* -algebra, every observable $A \in \mathcal{A}_{matter}$ will have a spectrum $SPEC A$ and we shall have $SPEC A = spec A$.

Knowing $\mathcal{A}_{matter}$ is natural to ask about its *commutant* $\mathcal{A}'_{matter}$ which consists of all observables of the weak quantum theoretical system commuting with all material observables:

$$\mathcal{A}'_{matter} = \{B \in \mathcal{A} \mid BA = AB \text{ for all } A \in \mathcal{A}_{matter}\} \quad (9)$$

Primas [4], in the framework of ordinary quantum theory, essentially identifies $\mathcal{A}'_{matter}$ with the subalgebra of mental observables and assumes a decomposition of the Hilbert space and the observable algebra of the *unus mundus* of the kind

$$\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_{matter} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{mind}, \quad \mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_{matter} \otimes \mathcal{A}_{mind} \quad (10)$$

This means that matter and mind observables always commute.

We prefer a complementary relationship between matter and mind, in accordance with the intention of W. Pauli and C. G. Jung [7], [8]. For instance, under the headings of "brain" and "mind" one and the same system can be investigated in two very different ways, either physiologically with the methods of physical observation and experimentation or psychologically by introspection, redirection of self attentiveness and reporting about them. These two approaches will use complementary "matter" and "mind" observables respectively. So, for us,

$$\mathcal{A}_{mind} \cap (\mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{A}'_{matter}) \neq \emptyset \quad (11)$$

4 The Wheeler-de Witt Equation and Cosmological Time

In this section, we want to describe, how time can be introduced in cosmology in a primarily timeless framework by means of a solution of the Wheeler-de Witt equation. It is our intention to generalize this scheme to Weak Quantum Theory, which will be done in the subsequent section.

The essentials of the principle can best be understood from a very simple toy model.

Consider a system in ordinary quantum theory, whose algebra of observables is generated by two observables X and Y together with their conjugates P_X and P_Y . The fundamental commutation relations are just the commutation relations for position and momentum of a point particle in two dimensional space:

$$[X, Y] = [P_X, P_Y] = [X, P_Y] = [Y, P_X] = 0 \quad (12)$$

$$[X, P_X] = [Y, P_Y] = i\frac{\hbar}{2\pi}\mathbb{1} \quad (13)$$

In a basis of simultaneous eigenstates $|x, y\rangle$ of X and Y , state vectors of the system will be given by functions $\psi(x, y)$. Assume now that the state function obeys an equation

$$\left(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} - \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y^2}\right)\psi(x, y) = 0 \quad (14)$$

In our simple example it is even possible to give the general solution of eq 14 :

$$\psi(x, y) = f(x - y) + g(x + y) \quad (15)$$

for arbitrary functions f and g .

In general, the solution eq 15 does not factorize into a function of x and a function of y , although there are, of course, also special factorizing solutions like

$$\psi(x, y) = \sin(kx) \sin(ky), \quad (16)$$

but generically the solution of eq 14 will not factorize but will be entangled with respect to the observables X and Y . Entangled solutions are only representable as superpositions of factorizing solutions. Now, in contrast to a factorizing solution like eq 16, for an entangled solution, the distribution of the values of y will depend on the value of x . In this sense, x controls the knowledge of y . In the extreme case

$$|\psi\rangle = \int dx c(x) |x, y(x)\rangle \quad (17)$$

the value of x even completely determines y , the other extreme is just given by factorizing solutions like eq 16.

This allows to interpret the controlling variable x as a time variable, whereby a factorizing solution would describe a time independent situation. For a hyperbolic equation like 14, the time like variable x shares another feature of time as it is normally understood in physics: Prescribing the initial values for $x = 0$:

$$\psi(0, y) = a(y), \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial x}\psi(0, y) = b(y) \quad (18)$$

will completely fix the solution of the state equation 14 for all values of the time x . This means that the hyperbolic character of eq 14 leads to a deterministic time development with respect to x .

The Wheeler-de Witt equation [24] is an equation for the wave function of the universe in quantum cosmology, which can be conceived as an enormous upgrading of our toy model eq 14. An infinity of pairs of conjugate variables enters rather than just two, such that the variable X is replaced by the spacial metric h_{ab} of the universe, and Y corresponds to an infinity of observables φ pertaining to matter fields in the universe. The derivatives in eq 14 are to be replaced by functional derivatives with respect to h_{ab} and φ . The wave function $\psi(x, y)$ is replaced by a functional $|\Psi[h_{ab}, \varphi]\rangle$ depending on the spacial metric and the matter fields. The Wheeler-de Witt equation is a direct consequence of the invariance of General Relativity Theory under arbitrary coordinate transformations. It has a structure similar to eq 14, which we write down for the benefit of the reader with some familiarity in quantum field theory:

$$\left\{ -\frac{1}{2m_P^2} G_{ab,cd} \frac{\delta^2}{\delta h_{ab} \delta h_{cd}} - m_P^2 \sqrt{h} R^{(3)} + H_{matter}[h_{ab}, \varphi] \right\} |\Psi[h_{ab}, \varphi]\rangle = 0 \quad (19)$$

Here, m_P is the so-called Planck mass, h is the determinant of h_{ab} , $R^{(3)}$ is the scalar curvature associated to h_{ab} and $G_{ab,cd}$ is a metric in the infinite dimensional "superspace" of spatial metrics and given by

$$G_{ab,cd} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{h}} (h_{ac} h_{bd} + h_{ad} h_{bc} - h_{ab} h_{cd}) \quad (20)$$

$H_{matter}[h_{ab}, \varphi]$ is a term depending on the metric and the matter fields, whose precise form depends on the model for the matter fields.

The Wheeler-de Witt equation 19 does not contain any reference to time, but, depending on the nature of its solution, a time variable can be introduced in a way completely analogous to our toy model. The metric $G_{ab,cd}$ is of hyperbolic character, and this opens up the possibility to interpret one combination of the variables h_{ab} as a time variable monitoring a

deterministic development of the other variables if the solution of eq 19 is not factorizing [27].

Which variable precisely takes over the role of a time depends on the solution of eq 19. Models have been constructed, whose solution corresponds to an expanding universe, and in these models, it is the determinant function $\sqrt{\hbar}$, which takes over the role of a time variable. The quantity $\sqrt{\hbar}$ is directly related to the radius of the universe, which in an expanding universe serves as a measure of time. The fact that time is normally felt as a classical parameter rather than a quantum observable is explained by a mechanism of *decoherence* [28]. By the interaction with the infinity of other degrees of freedom, the time operator $\sqrt{\hbar}$ is effectively measured continuously, and the state of the universe becomes indistinguishable from an incoherent superposition of states with different values of the time observable.

5 Emergence of time in Weak Quantum Theory

The core of the argument of the preceding section on the emergence of time in quantum cosmology can be transferred to Weak Quantum Theory applied to the state of the *unus mundus*. A discussion in terms of Weak Quantum Theory seems to be mandatory because we do not expect the formalism of full ordinary quantum theory to be applicable at this level of generality. Essentially, we locate time primarily in individual consciousness and assume entanglement correlations to be the decisive mechanism for time synchronization. The motivation of this approach are a neutral monistic attitude towards the mind matter problem and the simple observations that time is intimately related to our mode of existence as conscious individuals and that our internal time shows a high degree of correlation with the internal times of other individuals and with changes in the material world. This suggests that the state of the *unus mundus* is strongly entangled. More precisely, our scenario is as follows:

1. We already mentioned in section 3 that individual consciousness, at least at some low level, is intimately related to the epistemic split, which, after all consists in the isolation of an observing subject from the rest of the world. In addition, the distinction between matter and mind requires the epistemic split. This means that subsemigroups $\mathcal{A}_i \subset \mathcal{A}$ of the semigroup of observables of the *unus mundus* are established and identified, which correspond to conscious individuals and will have a nonvanishing intersection with $\mathcal{A}_{mind}$ of eq 11. Moreover, the relationship between $\mathcal{A}_i$ and $\mathcal{A}_{matter}$ will be largely a complementary one.
2. The *unus mundus* itself is timeless, but after the epistemic split, observables $T_i \in \mathcal{A}_i$ will be identifiable, which, similar to the situation for the Wheeler- de Witt equation, due to the entangledness of the state of the *unus mundus*, assume time character, monitoring other observables via entanglement correlations. Our mode of personal existence reveals that T_i will have the quality of an A-time in the sense of ref [10]. The quality of A-time will depend on the level of consciousness. For simple organisms the notion of

”now” will be the predominant feature, and a faint notion of past will be able to incorporate the results of learning from the environment. At higher levels, the notion of past will be more elaborate, and a self model [22] will allow planning of actions and the development of a differentiated notion of future. So, the spectrum $specT_i$ will contain at least an element ”now” and, depending on the level of consciousness a simple or elaborate set of labels pertaining to the more or less remote past and future. It is only by entanglement correlations that T_i assumes the quality of a time. Unlike the situation for the Wheeler-de Witt equation we do not expect any strict property of hyperbolicity to hold, because this would lead to a deterministic dependence on T_i , which is highly implausible at this level of generality and for the primarily individual A-time T_i .

3. For well separated different individuals we can expect their time observables to commute:

$$T_i T_j = T_j T_i \quad (21)$$

There will be entanglement correlations between different time observables T_i and T_j giving a rough synchronization between them.

4. Entanglement correlations will also exist with material systems. These correlations will be particularly strong for ”clock-like” systems, for instance certain astronomical systems. The observable semigroup $\mathcal{A}_I$ of these systems will contain clock observables T_I which show particularly strong entanglement correlations among each others and with the variables T_i . Again, we expect commutativity

$$T_I T_J = T_J T_I, \quad T_i T_I = T_I T_i \quad (22)$$

These strong correlations make it possible to transport a notion of time into material systems and to attribute the quality of time also to the variables T_I . However, the A-character of time will get lost in this transport operation, and T_I will rather look like a B-time.

5. Such processes of transportation and identification can be used to construct a more and more universal and operationalized time by taking into account more and more entanglement correlations and by choosing and redefining time observables such as to maximize their entanglement correlations. This process of purification and operationalization is really what happened in the development of the notion of time in human thinking in general and in particular in the development of science, eventually leading to the concept of time in contemporary physics. With respect to this time, physical determinism will hold, at least to a very good approximation and with respect to $\mathcal{A}_{matter}$. Even the notion of internal time is reconsidered and modified under the influence of physical time. This process leading to a clear and sharp notion of B-time, of course required human consciousness at its highest level. The same holds for a manifold of elaborations of B-time like cyclic time or mythological time, which have been developed in various human societies.

The redefinition of an observable can easily be formalized in the framework of Weak Quantum Theory: Let A and B be observables and take a function

$$f : spec A \longrightarrow spec B \quad (23)$$

Then we say that $B = f(A)$ if the following relations hold for the associated projectors A_α and B_β of eq 1:

$$B_\beta = \bigvee_{\alpha \in spec A, f(\alpha)=\beta} A_\alpha \quad (24)$$

Just like in the previous chapter, the fact that physical time is normally experienced as a classical quantity with a sharp value, is explained by a decoherence mechanism. As compared to ordinary quantum theory, the situation might be more favorable in Weak Quantum Theory, because, due to the absence of a probability interpretation, the notion of a collapse of states is not necessarily present in Weak Quantum Theory.

6. In the course of generalization and objectivation, time loses more and more of its original qualities as A-time. Some steps on this way are: Internal A-time, directed B-time and undirected B-time of time reversal invariant physics. In contemporary physics, this process has even gone further. In parts of string theory, as well as in quantum cosmology, timeless equations like the Wheeler-de Witt equation have been formulated in which time has disappeared altogether. Using a term employed by E. Ruhnau [23] in a rather different context, one might talk about *deconstruction of time* as one of the effects of the collective effort towards an increasing sharpening and purification of the notion of time.

Here, there may be the right place for a brief comparison of our approach with the beautiful work of H. Primas [4]:

Primas tentatively applies ordinary quantum theory to the *unus mundus*. A first symmetry breaking leads to the decomposition into (collective) mind and matter of eq 10. As opposed to our approach, matter and mind observables are commuting rather than complementary. Time has its origin in a one parameter symmetry of the timeless *unus mundus* and, after the decomposition into matter and mind, appears with the representation of the symmetry group in the collective mind sector. Synchronization with and transfer to the matter sector is achieved by entanglement correlations which are a consequence of the original symmetry of the *unus mundus*. It is reassuring and it adds to the cogency of this picture to see the importance of entanglement correlations also from a rather different approach. After the decomposition of the *unus mundus* into the commuting mind and matter sectors, the scenario of Primas has much in common with Leibniz' view of a world governed by prestabilized harmony, whereas we keep closer to the picture of Jung and Pauli [7], [8]. A further difference is that in his scheme B-time is born readily made in one step, while we try to investigate the process of its stepwise emergence. Using full quantum mechanics and representation theory of groups in Hilbert spaces, Primas manages to derive a large number of interesting results and notions relevant for the concept of time. He makes important remarks about the

origin of the directedness of time, which for us is present from the beginning, and about the synchronization of the time arrows, even for non interacting systems, by entanglement. In describing features of time in the mind sector he uses the notion of a forward expanding Hilbert-space K-structure, which describes learning and the filling up of a memory storage by the accumulation of experience. Once time has been established along the route described above in points 1 till 6, the related notion of an increasing sequence of propositions can easily be incorporated into Weak Quantum Theory. A family of propositions $(P_\tau)_{\tau \in \mathbb{R}}$ can be called increasing, if

$$P_\tau P_\sigma = P_\sigma P_\tau = P_\sigma \text{ for } \sigma \leq \tau \quad (25)$$

6 Questions, Observations, Speculations

The issues raised in this last chapter are placed here not because we consider them less important but because they lie somewhat off the main line of our argument.

- First of all, one should not forget that, in spite of its pervading importance, the aspect of time cannot be applied to everything. On the contrary, there are many observables, for instance observables pertaining to logical questions or to issues of sense and meaning, which are unrelated or complementary to time. There will be many observables A with

$$AT_i \neq T_i A \quad (26)$$

- Energy is a particularly clear and important example of such observables. In ordinary quantum theory, the energy operator is conjugate to time and generates time translations. The operator for a translation of time by an amount α is given by

$$U_\alpha = e^{2\pi i \alpha H / \hbar} \quad (27)$$

where H is the energy operator. The question now arises, whether the concept of energy can be generalized in a qualified way such that it applies beyond the realm of ordinary physics. The wider applicability of notions like complementarity and entanglement has been demonstrated in Weak Quantum Theory. The notion of time is never restricted to the domain of physics, and this study was devoted to it. It would be desirable also to provide a qualified generalization of the notion of energy. For instance, given a sufficiently universal but not entirely physical time observable T , one would like to define an operator U_α fulfilling a relation like

$$U_\alpha T U_\alpha^{-1} = T + \alpha \quad (28)$$

There is, of course, an intuitive notion of energy used in everyday language, and the notion of energy in physics arose from it by a process of sharpening and operationalization similar to the one described for time above. In a very vague sense, this notion

is related to the capability of effectuating changes. Associated to the intuitive notion of time is an element of will and desire, which is one of the features which have got lost in the operationalization to the energy in physics. A version of equation 28 may be able to capture some features of the intuitive notion of energy. Quite generally, energy should be related to any kind of transition. Transitions are topicalized in *process philosophy*. Normally, descriptions of the functioning of human mind are centered on a discussion of its concepts, notions and categories which can be associated to more or less stable states of the mind. Emphasis may be shifted to transitions, which are just the contrary of categorizations and genuinely acategorical [29]. The generalized energy observable should be closely related to such acategorical features of the human mind. This mental aspect of energy must not be completely disjoint from its material side. In fact, Bekenstein [30] argues, that every exchange of information is associated to a, however tiny, minimal exchange of energy.

- We already emphasized on several occasions the paramount importance of the epistemic split for every act of cognition. The very notion of an observable already presupposes it, and the semigroup of observables is subject to perspectiveness and depends on the observer. Now, given that the observer is a conscious individual, and that time is intimately related to the form of existence of conscious individuals, it would not be surprising to find temporal features in any semigroup of observables. This is indeed the case. The notion of composition of observables contains an embryonic element of time in as far as AB means "A applied **after** B", where "after" is always meant in a temporal sense.
- Time also enters in another way into the semigroup $\mathcal{A}$ of observables. The state of the observer will change, not the least as a result of the observations he makes. The observer dependence of the semigroup of observables will thus render it time dependent, too. This change may result in adding or modifying observables and also in the transformation of preobservables, as described at the end of Chapter 2, into full fledged observables.
- Finally, having discussed time at considerable length, one might wonder about space. We expect also space to arise only after the epistemic split. As opposed to time, it will have its origin in the material component $\mathcal{A}_{matter}$ of the *unus mundus*. This corresponds well with Descartes' attribution of space to the *res extensae* and with the way Kant interprets time as the form of the outer rather than the inner sense. These questions certainly deserve a study of their own.

Acknowledgement

I should like to thank Harald Atmanspacher for many inspiring critical discussions on the subject of this article and for valuable improvement suggestions. Klaus Jacobi's philosophical insight was of great help for me. Very special thanks are due to Georg Ernst Jacoby for inspiration and continuous encouragement.

References

- [1] H. Atmanspacher, H. Römer, H. Walach: "Weak Quantum Theory: Complementarity and Entanglement in Physics and Beyond." <http://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0104109>, *Foundations of Physics* **32** (2002), 379-406
- [2] H. Walach and H. Römer : Complementarity is a useful concept for consciousness studies. A reminder. *Neuroendocrinology Letters* **21**(2000), 221–232.
- [3] H. Römer: "Neue Aspekte einer verallgemeinerten Quantentheorie" Talk Offenburg Oct.2003, unpublished
- [4] H. Primas. "Time-Entanglement between Mind and Matter" *Mind and Matter* **1**(2003), 81-121
- [5] H. Atmanspacher, E. Ruhnau eds: "Time, Temporality, Now" Experiencing Time and Concepts of Time in an Interdisciplinary Perspective, Springer1997, ISBN 3-540-62486-4
- [6] E. Pöppel: "Time perception", in *Handbook of Sensory Physiology Vol. 8*, ed. by R. Held, H.W. Leibowitz and H.-L. Teubner, Springer, Berlin 1978, pp. 713–729., "A hierarchical model of temporal perception". *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* **1**, 56–61. See also E. Pöppel (1997): The brain's way to create "nowness", contribution in ref [5]
- [7] H. Atmanspacher, H. Primas, E. Wertenschlag-Birkhäuser eds "Der Pauli-Jung Dialog und seine Bedeutung für die moderne Wissenschaft", Springer 1995, ISBN 3-540-58518-4
- [8] C.A. Meier ed with C.P. Enz and M. Fierz: "Wolfgang Pauli und C.G. Jung, ein Briefwechsel 1932-1958, Springer 1992, ISBN 3-540-54663-4
- [9] H. Atmanspacher, Th. Filk, H. Römer: "Quantum Zeno Features of Bistable Perception", to appear in "Biological Cybernetics", <http://arxiv.org/abs/physics/0302005> ,
- [10] J.E. McTaggart: "The Unreality of Time" *Mind* **17** (1908); 456-473
- [11] M. Pauen: "Grundprobleme der Philosophie des Geistes" 3rd edition 2002, Fischer Verlag, ISBN 3-596-14568-6
- [12] D.J. Chalmers: "The Conscious Mind", Oxford university press 1996, ISBN 0-19-510553-2
- [13] R. Descartes: "Discours de la méthode, pour bien conduire la raison et chercher la vérité dans les sciences" (1637), "Meditationes de prima philosophia" (1641), "Principia philosophiae" (1644)
- [14] N. Malbranche: "De la recherche de la vérité" (1674)

- [15] G.W. Leibniz: "Sämtliche Schriften und Briefe", ed Preußische Akademie der Wissenschaften 1923ff
- [16] F.W. Hegel: "Phänomenologie des Geistes" (1807), "Logik" (1812-16)
- [17] B. Spinoza: Kritische Ausgabe 4 vols (1925), C. Gebhardt ed
- [18] A. Augustinus: "Confessiones", J. Bernhart ed 1965
- [19] I. Kant: "Kritik der reinen Vernunft" (1781), 2nd edition 1787
- [20] E. Husserl: "Husserliana" H.L. Van Breda ed. 1950ff
- [21] M. Heidegger: "Sein und Zeit" (1927)
- [22] Th. Metzinger: "Subjekt und Selbstmodell. Die Perspektivität phänomenalen Bewusstseins vor dem Hintergrund einer naturalistischen Theorie mentaler Repräsentationen", Paderborn, München, Wien 1993
- [23] E. Ruhnau: "The Deconstruction of Time" Contribution in ref [5]
- [24] J.A. Wheeler: "Superspace and the Nature of Quantum Geometrodynamics", *Battelle rencontres* 1968, C. M. de Witt, J. A Wheeler eds
- [25] R. Haag: "Local quantum Physics, Fields, Particles, Algebras" Springer 1992, ISBN 3-540-53610-8, 0-387-53610-8
- [26] G. Mahler: Talk given at the Quantum Mind Conference, Tucson March 15-19 2003, J. Gemmer, G. Mahler: "Entanglement and the Factorization Approximation" Eur. Phys. J. **D 17** (2001), 385-393, A. Otte, G. Mahler: "Adapted-Operator Representation: Selective versus Collective Properties of Quantum Networks" Phys. Rev **A62**, (2000), 012303
- [27] C. Kiefer: "Conceptual Issues in Quantum Cosmology" Proceedings of the Karpacz Winterschool "From Cosmology to Quantum Gravity" Springer 1999
- [28] E. Joos, H.D. Zeh, C. Kiefer, D. Giulini, J. Kupsch, I.,-O. Stamatescu: "Decoherence and the appearance of a Classical World on Quantum Theory" 2nd edition, Springer 2003, ISBN 3-540-00390-8
- [29] H. Atmanspacher, W. Fach: "Acategory as Mental Instability", European Studies in Process Thought, in press
- [30] J.D. Bekenstein: "Universal Upper Bound on Entropy to Energy Ratio for Bounded Systems", Phys. Rev. **D23** (1981), 287-298, J.D. Bekenstein, M.S. Schiffer: "Quantum Limitations on the Storage and Transmission of Information", Int. Journal of Mod. Phys. **C1** (1990), 355-422, J.D. Bekenstein: "The Limits of Information", Stud Hist. Philos. Mod. Phys. **32** (2001), 511-524